



LAWRENCE
LIVERMORE
NATIONAL
LABORATORY

Test Results of the First US ITER TF Conductor in SULTAN

N. N. Martovetsky, D. R. Hatfield, J. R. Miller, C.-Y.
Gung, J. S. Schultz, N. Cheggour, L. F. Goodrich, P.
Bruzzone, B. Stepanov, R. Wesche , B. Seeber

August 20, 2008

Applied Superconductivity Conference
Chicago, IL, United States
August 17, 2008 through August 22, 2008

Disclaimer

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States government. Neither the United States government nor Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, nor any of their employees makes any warranty, expressed or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

Test Results of the First US ITER TF Conductor in SULTAN

Nicolai N. Martovetsky, Daniel R. Hatfield, John R. Miller, Chen-yu Gung, Joel S. Schultz, Najib Cheggour, Loren F. Goodrich, Pierluigi Bruzzone, Boris Stepanov, Rainer Wesche and Bernd Seeber

Abstract— The US Domestic Agency is one of six parties supplying TF cable-in-conduit conductors (CICCs) for ITER. Previous tests have shown that measured performance of the TF CICCs can be much lower than expected from the strand properties at the projected uniaxial strain and that the cabling pattern may also be an important factor. Worst of all, voltage signals well below the expected critical surface could not be reliably interpreted or canceled, making test results very suspect. The TFUS1 sample was prepared to achieve multiple goals: 1) to ensure uniform current distribution and to eliminate parasitic voltage signals by improving joints, 2) to explore the potential benefits of a different cabling pattern for better support of strain-sensitive strands, and 3) to explore the source of voltage development in the cable through the use of innovative penetrating diagnostics. Test results of the first US-made samples are presented and discussed.

Index Terms— Superconducting device testing, Superconducting cables, Superconducting materials measurements

I. INTRODUCTION

FOR economic considerations, the temperature margin for ITER TF conductors has been set relatively low, but to ensure reliable operation of the ITER TF magnets, all TF conductors supplied to ITER must first be qualified in SULTAN facility at CRPP, Switzerland [1]. Also, qualifying of full scale conductor is necessary because, to date, there is no reliable correlation between performance of individual strands and the performance of the full CICC.

Previous tests of the developmental TF CICCs have revealed that CICC properties are often much lower than the sum of the strands and that voltage signals appear substantially before the onset of current sharing, making a reliable assessment of the

test results difficult or impossible. It has been assumed [2-3] that the most probable reason for the “early voltage” is a nonuniform current distribution in the cable and it has been shown that there is no reliable way to cancel this effect by post-processing [3]. This leaves only one possibility – eliminating this “early” voltage by a proper preparation of the sample. It is necessary to reduce substantially the inter-strand resistance in the cable – where we can – in the joint regions. Since a previous attempt with solder-filled terminations [4] did not lead to an improvement of the “early” voltage signals, the US team made a more deliberate effort wherein the subcable wraps were first removed, then the chrome plating on the strands was chemically etched away (prior to termination, compaction, and heat treatment), and finally the terminals were chemically cleaned and solder-filled after heat treatment.

At the beginning of the TFUS1 sample fabrication, most of the TF relevant samples tested in SULTAN did not meet ITER requirements. The reason was uncertain and innovative ideas were solicited. Based on successful experience with the 45 T hybrid magnet superconducting outsert, one of the authors (John Miller) proposed an alternative cable design, based on the stiff “six-around one” pattern rather than traditional soft “triplet” configuration used so far in most CICCs for fusion applications, including ITER. Thus, the US team built two legs, one with the cabling specified by ITER Option I and another leg with an alternative cabling [5].

Another goal, which we tried to accomplish, was to measure the origin of the voltage. This question has a long history. There is a strong gradient (about 1 -1.6 T) of the magnetic field across the ITER CICC. The question is: which part of the cable starts generating resistance first– the one in high field, or in low field? In the high field area the strands experience only forces generated in these strands themselves. In the low field, forces are accumulated from the whole cable and generate very high pressure on the strands. In order to study this, we used specially designed penetrating sensors that take voltage signals from individual strands.

II. SAMPLE DESIGN

The TFUS1 sample contained two legs, made of two different cables, containing different strands made by Luvata. One leg, which we refer to as the “ITER” leg, had a cable specified by ITER as Option I. The leg with the cable designed by J. Miller on the basis of six-around-one subcables is referred to as the “Alt”.

The terminations were designed to provide minimal

Manuscript received 19 August 2008. This work performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by Oak Ridge National Laboratory under contract DE-AC05-00OR22725 and by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344

N.M. is with Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, on assignment to Oak Ridge National Laboratory, ORNL, USIPO, 1055 Commerce Park, 37831, phone 865-576 2100, fax 865-574 8393, e-mail: martovetsky@ornl.gov

D.H. and J.M. are with ORNL, millerjr1@usiter.org

C.G. and J.S. are with MIT PSFC, gung@psfc.mit.edu

N.C. and L.G. are with NIST, cheggour@boulder.nist.gov

P.B., B.St. and R.W. are with CRPP, Switzerland, pierluigi.bruzzone@psi.ch

B.Se. is with University of Geneva, Switzerland, Bernd.Seeber@physics.unige.ch




Fig. 1. TFUS1 instrumentation map. “T” denotes temperature sensors, “V” denotes voltage taps

transverse resistance between the strands and because of that were sintered during heat treatment and solder filled after that. The parameters of the conductors and fabrication details are given in [5].

III. INSTRUMENTATION

Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 show location of the voltage taps and




Fig. 2. Position of the sensors in the cross section of the conductors.

temperature sensors.

The voltage taps were of two types – penetrating and conventional. The penetrating samples had a copper tip in contact with the strands. The conventional type taps were attached to the conduit surface. The temperature sensors were mounted in a slot in the copper insert for better thermal contact.

IV. TEST RESULTS

A. Early voltage signals

The TFUS1 sample gave a very low voltage signals (typically less than $0.7 \mu\text{V}$) on all pairs of voltage taps as long as operating parameters were far away from the critical surface at all currents. That proves that all distribution of current takes place in the terminations because resistance between the strands is low. With such terminations there is no ambiguity in determination of the real performance of the CICC. This result shows that solder filling of the termination can provide a uniform distribution in the CICC at the specified voltage of $4.5 \mu\text{V}$. This is in contradiction to the previously reported experience [4] where solder filling after HT did not reduce the early voltage.

B. Joints resistance

The joint resistance at the lower joint was measured to be $1.5 \text{ n}\Omega$ and the resistances to the facility flags were $0.6 \text{ n}\Omega$ and $0.7 \text{ n}\Omega$, correspondingly. These resistances are very low, but not record low among similar conductors tested at SULTAN. That shows that the overall low resistance of the joint does not guarantee a uniform current distribution.

C. Thermometry

Temperature sensors show disagreement with the facility inlet and outlet sensors that are known to be reliable. The deviation varied from several tens to 1 K . We had to recalibrate the sensors on the sample every day when we measured T_{cs} or I_c against facility sensors due to a slight but non-negligible drift between shots on different days.

D. T_{cs} measurements

For the T_{cs} measurements we used voltage taps over the 450 mm base of the high magnetic field area. For the ITER baseline leg the sensors were V8-V4 on the high field side and V8A-V4A on the low field side. For the Alt leg, the pairs were V7-V3 and V7A-V3A, respectively. To determine the T_{cs} we chose the highest voltage value (lowest T_{cs} value), which happened to be V4A-V8A and V3-V7. The difference between these locations and locations on the opposite side was $0.2\text{-}0.3 \text{ K}$.

The “effective average temperature” T_{ave} was averaged between the T4, T8 and T8A for the ITER leg and T3, T7 and T7A for the Alt leg.

Fig. 3 shows transitions of the both legs of the TFUS1 before cycles and approximating curves. In order to process the data we used our observation that the transition in CICC is exponential versus current, temperature and magnetic field, just like in the strands [6]. We used as an approximation the following relation:




Fig. 3. Volt-temperature characteristics of the TFUS1 conductors and fitting curves

$$E = 0.1 \exp([T - T_{cs}(B)]/T_0) \quad (1)$$

Where E is expressed in $\mu\text{V}/\text{cm}$, T_{cs} is the current sharing temperature, and T_0 is the temperature increment. The conventional criteria of T_{cs} is $0.1 \mu\text{V}/\text{cm}$. The approximating curve must hit only lowest points on the V-T curves, since those are the equilibrium points and other points are transients.

Both legs comfortably meet ITER requirement of 5.7 K .

It is known, that the deviation of the parameter T_0 (or related to that, N-value) in CICC from the T_0 (N-value) in the strand at the same conditions is a very sensitive parameter showing degradation or problems with current uniformity [7]. The N-value is the exponent in the approximation:

$$E = 0.1(I/I_c)^N \quad (2)$$

The N-value measurements in the Volt- Ampere characteristic is difficult in SULTAN because of significant noise and varying temperature in the sample due to Ohmic heat in the joints and self heating in the conductor when the current is changing. The strand N-value at such currents in the strand is about 15. Calculation of the N-value from the measured T_0 parameter and derivatives dI/dT gives the N-value of about 10, which shows low degradation and low current nonuniformity. This reduction in N is consistent with our observation of voltage appearance in the high pressure area with broad transition (discussed below). In the recent measurements of strongly degraded CICC samples the N-value was much lower [8].




Fig. 4. Evolution of T_{cs} and T_0 versus number of cycles. Tol is the T_0 for the left leg (ITER) and Tor is for the right leg (Alt)




Fig. 5 Voltage signals from the ITER leg, same strand, in high field and high pressure areas at the first charge

E. Degradation due to cyclic load

One of the most important characteristics of the CICC is its ability to withstand cyclic loads. Fig. 4 shows evolution of the current sharing temperature T_{cs} and the parameter of transition broadness T_0 as a result of cycling. Degradation of the T_{cs} in both legs is small, especially in the Alt leg. There is slight broadening of the transition, but it should not affect seriously operating margins of the conductor.

F. Observations of the voltage origination

Our penetrating sensors allowed studying the place of the voltage signal origination in the CICC. The degradation of the Nb3Sn strands in the CICC is one of the top topics of discussion. At the moment the leading speculation is that the degradation is caused by bending the strands in the cable under electromagnetic (EM) forces. Others think that it is a pinching effect that causes the degradation. The forces are highest in the low field area. However, many researches think that the voltage is originated in the high field area. The strands in the high field do not experience forces on the strands other than their own, which are low. The strands in the low field area experience the force from the whole cable, containing about 1000 strands. Our penetrating voltage taps on the ITER leg allowed measurements of the voltage from the same strand, on the base of 15 mm. On the Alt leg we could only attached the pins to the same subcable, not the same strand due to a sharp twist pitch of the subcable.

Fig. 5 shows development of the voltage in the strands in high field and in high pressure (low field) areas at the first T_{cs} measurement in 11 T, at 68 kA. The voltage appears first in the high field area and then in 1 K or so it starts appearing in the high pressure area. After the cycling took place, the voltage in the strand in the high field area in the ITER leg decreased and increased in the high pressure area (Fig. 6); the latter voltage is still lower than in the high field area. It is observed also, that the transition is broader in the high pressure area, presumably, an indication of mechanical damage of the filaments by the EM forces. Thus, some strands improve their characteristics, relieving stress after cooldown due to EM forces and evidently some strands degrade. The Alt leg, showed similar performance as ITER leg, but the effect of




Fig. 6 Same voltage taps as in Fig. 5, after 600 cycles

cycles was much smaller.

These particular conductors did not show high degradation versus cyclic load, but some other ITER conductors did [8]. Although high field area remained a “weak link” responsible for overall CICC performance, it seems possible that in high degrading conductors the weak link is in the low field area. That would require revision of our views on the Nb3Sn degradation in CICC, since at the moment all analyses on degradation assume that the voltage originates first in the high field area.

V. TEST ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

A. Comparison of the CICC performance with the strand performance

The strands were characterized in four laboratories. In two laboratories (NIST and University of Geneva) the characterization took place on the Walter springs, while the other two laboratories measured I_c on the ITER barrels. Table I gives averaged results of the measurements. NIST and UG data are shown at the compressive strain of 0.1%. Note that the NIST data are taken at 4.0 K, not 4.2 and no correction made for that in the Table I. The Luvata data are for 240 hr heat treatment at 650 C, the rest are for 200 hr at 650 C..

TABLE 1 $I_c(12T, 4.2 K, -0.1\%)$ OF LUVATA STRANDS USED IN TFUS1 LEGS

	Alt I_c , A	Alt j_c , A/mm ²	ITER I_c , A	ITER j_c , A/mm ²
Luvata	197	922	240	935
NIST	193	903	223	871
CRPP	181	847	208	812
U Geneva	190	889	230	898

As we can see the scatter is significant. In the ITER community it is conventional to express the strand performance in the CICC in terms of “effective” uniaxial degradation despite full realization that the stress conditions in the CICC are 3D. We used University of Geneva

measurements, since these were the only ones performed at the elevated temperatures. Analysis showed that the effective strain was -0.52 % for ITER specified strands and -0.51% for the Alt strands. The expected value was in the range of -0.6-0.7%, based on the previous experience. Post test measurements of the strain performed at the CRPP showed that the compression of the jacket was low. There are at least two possibilities. First that the cable slipped after heat treatment and following cooldown. This explanation seems unlikely, since the ends are compacted to 20% over 500 mm length. Second, the cable expands less than expected. We do not have data to verify this, but such low residual strain needs further investigation.

B. Comparison between performance of the Alt cable and ITER Option I cable pattern

As we can see from Fig. 4, the performance of the Alt cable leg is superior to the ITER Option I by approximately 0.4 K and has lower sensitivity to the cycles. That is a very significant margin. In terms of critical current gain, it is equivalent to almost 17%, which shows that there is a reserve to boost the temperature margin of the ITER conductors by optimizing the cabling pattern.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Both legs in the TFUS1 met ITER requirements with a comfortable margin. We proved that by proper preparation of the terminations it is possible to obtain a uniform current distribution and eliminate guesswork in the CICC performance assessment.

Using innovative penetrating voltage taps we discovered that in our conductors voltage appears first in the high field area, but after cycles, voltage is generated also in the high pressure area of the cable, in the low field region. Transition in this area is much broader than in the high field region. That observation gives credence to the speculation that the broadening of the overall transition is explained by strand damage in the high pressure areas of the cable.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Bruzzone, A. Anghel, A. Fuchs, et al, “Upgrade of Operating Range for SULTAN Test Facility,” *IEEE Appl. Supercond.*, vol. 12, p. 520-523, 2002.
- [2] N.N. Martovetsky, “Testing Large CICC in Short Sample Configuration and Predicting Their Performance in Large Magnets”, *IEEE Appl. Supercond.*, vol. 18, p. 1072 – 1075, 2008
- [3] N.N. Martovetsky, “Signal processing of data from short sample tests for the projection of conductor performance in ITER magnets”, *Supercond. Sci. Technol.* 21, 054013, 2008
- [4] B. Stepanov, P. Bruzzone, R. Wesche, M. Bagnasco, M. Vogel, D. Ciazynski, N. Martovetsky, “Re-Test of the TFAS1 Sample with solder filled extremities”, *IEEE Appl. Supercond.*, vol. 18, p. 1080-1083
- [5] C.Y. Gung, J.H. Kim, J.H. Schultz, N.N. Martovetsky, J.R. Miller, “Fabrication of US ITER TF Conductor Short Sample”, paper 2LPS03, this conference.
- [6] G.L. Dorofeev, A.B. Imenitov, E. Yu. Klimenko, “Voltage current characteristics of type III superconductors”, *Cryogenics*, vol. 22, N7, p. 367, 1982.
- [7] E.Yu. Klimenko, N.N. Martovetsky, “Numerical study of behavior of T-15 conductor”, *Cryogenics*, vol. 27, N5, p.242, 1987
- [8] P. Bruzzone; B. Stepanov, R. Wesche, et al, “Results of a New Generation of ITER TF Conductor Samples in SULTAN”, *IEEE Appl. Supercond.*, vol. 18, Issue 2, p. 459-462, 2008.

